

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 5 are amended, claim 2 is canceled and new claims 10 and 11 are added. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Andrews (Class AB Unity Grain Buffer Amplifier for CMOS technology, hereinafter "Andrews"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Andrews does not disclose, teach or even suggest at least a first differential amplifier circuit having a first differential pair and operating based on a common input voltage; a second differential amplifier circuit having a second differential pair and operating based on the common input voltage; a third transistor of a primary conductive type having a gate connected to a first output line of the first differential amplifier circuit; a third transistor of a secondary conductive type connected in series with the third transistor of the primary conductive type and having a gate connected to a second output line of the second differential amplifier circuit; and a third output line connected between the third transistor of the primary conductive type and the third transistor of the second conductive type outputs an output voltage, and the first, the second and the third output lines are shorted together, as recited in independent claim 1.

Instead, Andrews discloses in Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 that the output of the differential pair N1, N2 is connected to the gate of the transistor P4. The output of the differential pair P1, P2 is connected to the transistor N4. Andrews does not disclose, teach or even suggest that the output of the differential pair N1, N2 and the output of the differential pair

P1, P2 and the output line of the transistors P4, N4 are shorted together. Therefore, Andrews does not disclose, teach or even suggest the above-noted features of the independent claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 7-9 depend from independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saller (U.S. Patent No. 4,757,275) in view of Shulman (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,258). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Saller nor Shulman, individually or in combination, disclose, teach or even suggest a differential amplifier including at least a first differential amplifier circuit having a first differential pair and operating based on a common input voltage; a second differential amplifier circuit having a second differential pair and operating based on the common input voltage; a third transistor of a primary conductive type having a gate connected to a first input line of the first differential amplifier circuit; a third transistor of a second secondary conductive type connected in series to the third transistor of the primary conductive type and having a gate connected to a second output line of the second differential amplifier circuit; and a third output line connected between the third transistor of the primary conductive type and the third transistor of the second conductive type outputs an output voltage; and the first, the second and the third output lines are shorted together, as recited in independent claim 1.

Instead, Saller discloses in Fig. 3 that a differential pair 15, 16 has its output connected to the gate of transistor 21. The differential pair 17, 18, has its output connected to the gate of the transistor 22. However, Saller does not disclose, teach or even suggest the output line of transistors 21, 22, the output of the differential pair 15, 16 and the output of the

differential pair 17, 18 are shorted together. Accordingly, Saller does not disclose, teach or even suggest the above-listed features of independent claim 1.

Shulman does not compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of Saller. Shulman, for example, in Fig. 3, discloses that the output of the operational amplifier 303-N2 is connected to the gate of the transistor 304-N. The output of the operational amplifier 305-N2 is connected to the gate of transistor 306-N. However, Shulman does not disclose, teach or even suggest that the output line of transistor 304-N, 306-N, the output of the differential pair 303-N2 and the output of the differential pair 305-N2 are shorted together. Thus, Shulman does not disclose, teach or even suggest the above-noted features of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 define patentable subject matter. Claims 3-9 depend on independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Claim 2 is canceled, thus the rejection with respect to claim 2 is moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Moreover, newly added claims 10 and 11 depend from independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/dmw

Date: June 24, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--